

YOUNG INDIA

Vol. III

OCTOBER 1920

No. 10

The Meaning of India's Demand for Self-Determination

Will England persist in attempting to hold in subjection a nation of 315,000,000 civilized people—one fifth of the entire human race—against their united wish and will? If she does, the only possible result will be a war, a revolution, of the most bloody and terrible nature, by which she will be driven out of India, if not of all Asia.

J. T. SUNDERLAND

Published monthly by the India Home Rule League of America
1480 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 15 cents a copy. \$1.50 a year.

Entered as second class matter September 22, 1920, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Our Art Section

The Dance of Siva

By ANANDA CHANDRASEKHAR

The Dance of Siva is a ritual and plastic image of the process of becoming by which the universe exists. It is the ultimate energy revealed in the movements of the world process. As Maeterlinck writes "Our Lord is the Dancer (Nataraja) who, like the best dancer in the world, defines this power in mind and matter and makes them dance in their turn." More specifically, the dancer represents the "The activities" of creation, maintenance, evolution, and of the bondage and release of individual souls. The dance is eternal and universal, and he alone comprehends it who sees its movement in his own heart. It is a process without purpose or ambition; but "in this becoming change, the Spirit comprehends Himself" (Rigveda). It is the other side of the dance presented in the seated figure of Buddha, which may be likened to the Absolute at rest. In these two images are represented Being and Becoming, which are really one, in the movement of a groove is also the principle of its stability.

The Dance of Siva is the motif of innumerable South Indian images, and, indeed, the dominant figure in the unadorned southern school of bronze (or rather, copper) founding. Examples have also been found in Ceylon. Numer-

ally the individual works are of various degrees of merit; the finest like those in the Madras museum, one of which is reproduced here, are fully adequate expressions of their own theme, able to impress and to craftsmanship. It should be noticed that the dancing glory which formally framed the dancing figure in a circle, a broken away but the dwarf, representing ignorance, upon whom Siva stands, is to be seen below the right foot.

YOUNG INDIA

1400 BROADWAY
NEW YORK

EDITORIAL STAFF

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| J. T. Sunderland | Editor |
| H. B. Moser | Managing Editor |
| M. Miller | Business Editor |
| D. S. Vignaraja | General Manager |
| Ananda Chandrasekhara | Special Art Contributor |

ADVISORY BOARD

| | |
|------------------|-----------|
| J. T. Sunderland | Chairman |
| H. B. Moser | |
| J. W. Henshaw | |
| Frederic Henshaw | |
| Frederic Henshaw | |
| Samuel Tolson | Secretary |

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for opinions expressed in articles contributed to Young India.

Please make checks payable to Young India.

YOUNG INDIA, March, 1932



VENKATESWARA

Copper, about the 12th century, Madras Museum

YOUNG INDIA

Vol. III

OCTOBER 1920

No. 20

Editorial Notes

Daniel Webster on India

The pole of British rule in India is felt by the Indian people to be very heavy and very cruel. But even if it were as light as we are sometimes told that it is, still it would be heavily palling on an intelligent and high-minded people, because it is imposed by compulsion.

Said Daniel Webster: "No matter how easy may be the rule of a foreign power, no matter how lightly it may upon any man's shoulders, if it is not placed there by the voice of his own nature, and of his own country, he will not, he cannot, and he cannot not to be happy under the burden."

Andrew Carnegie on India

Andrew Carnegie made a tour through India, seeing with eyes that looked below the surface, and finding other things than those shown him by the British officials and bureaucrats. In other years he often expressed distrust of the British Government there, and sympathy with the Indian people in their struggle for freedom. Among other things he said: "I do not believe God ever made any man or any nation good

enough to rule any other man or any other nation."

Mr. Asquith and India

Many leading Englishmen, often over and over again, in their writings and their public speeches, all that Indian claims. For example, in a speech delivered in Birmingham in December, 1919, Mr. Asquith declared: "It is a most principle of democracy that every organized people is the true, the sovereign, the final and the only responsible judge of its own form of government."

This is very fine. India often hopes for this! It is only words. Why does not England treat them as she deals? In the face of such noble and just utterances as this of Mr. Asquith, made by hundreds of the greatest Englishmen, whenever India demands the right to be the judge of her own form of government, how British rulers at once declare it "sedition," "insubordination," "rebellion," and answer with sedition acts, poisoning acts, Rawlston acts, martial law, arrests, imprisonments and transportation. Shame on Englishmen! Must this dishonesty, this double-dealing, this playing fast and loose with truth, just and honor, go on forever?

Henry George on India

In the course of the new empire, can be no more reason to any country than alien rule, than shorter landlordism, than government and exploitation by foreigners whose primary object is their own advantage and not the welfare of the people under their control, who are constantly draining away the resources of the country for their own enrichment. Henry George saw that the economic principle applied in the fullest possible degree to India. Hence he wrote to his "Progress and Poverty",

The millions of India have bowed their heads beneath the yoke of money monopolies, but even of all the surely grinding weights of the English domination—a weight which is literally crushing millions out of existence, such as shown by English revenue chambers, it is nothing seriously to a whole continent's future monopolies have fixed in the land, and though bad and tyrannical in their rule, have not monopolized, and have monopolized by the people. But India now is like a giant slave owned by an alien and alien landlord.

"Civilizing the Hindus"

For Thomas Munro, one of the greatest civilizationalists, that Great Britain ever sent to India, in his evidence before a Parliamentary Committee appeared to inquire into Indian affairs nearly a century ago, made the following reply when asked about civilizing the Hindu people: "I do not know what is meant by civilizing the Hindu people. . . . If a good system of agriculture, animal husbandry, manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to the necessities of luxury, schools established in every village for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, the general

principles of hospitality and charity amongst each other; and, above all, a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect and delicacy—if these are among the aims which denote a civilized people, then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe, and, if civilization is to become an article of trade between the two countries, I am convinced that this country (England) will gain by the export cargo."

It was such a people that Great Britain had been holding in subjection for fifty years when this testimony was given, and has held in subjection by the power of the sword for a hundred years since, giving them no room in the shaping of their own government. It is such a people that the whole western world has been for centuries arrogantly and ignorantly looking down upon as non-human.

What Does India Want?

Mrs. John Pierpont, a highly honored New England dignitary, philanthropist and part of two generations ago, has answered exactly. In her struggle to attract more money to the place of houses and influence among the natives, which once she held, India wrote:

"A weapon that comes down as well

As ourselves fell upon the sod,
But occupies a homestead's wall.

As lightning does the will of God;
And from its force our doors our India
Can shield you—in the deluge-land."

No More Dictation, Please!

There are many seriously objectionable things about the new so-called "Re-

form Scheme" which the British Government has devised for India. Of these the first and most damning is:

It does not concede that India has any rights; it is the ruler of a master to slaves, because England possesses the power, therefore she may do what she pleases; there is nothing natural about (1) it is a thing imposed by one party upon the other, therefore it is a thing that India can accept only on her terms.

The answer that the Indian people should make to the foreigners who want these plans, and the answer that they are beginning to make is a voice like thunder: "We are rising from our knees to our feet. No more dictation! When you are ready to treat us as equals, as having at least as much rights in the management of this, our own country, as you have, and when as the India you are ready to propose a Government Reform Scheme—we to have an adequate representation in you in a joint commission to decide what that Scheme shall be—then we shall be ready to negotiate with you securely and honestly. If you are unwilling and humiliate men, and if you look upon us as just not as slaves, you can hardly expect us to allow any real co-operation before. No more dictation, please!"

Future Massacres in India

Besides the fact that the New Reform Scheme for the Government of India is a manifestly arbitrary and arrogant, does not admit that the Indian people have any rights, does not concede them as to what they want, but dictates to them what they must or may have, as if they were children, im-

mense or slaves, and not men, there is one other feature of the Scheme which alone should condemn it absolutely. It is clear. The Scheme offers to India no protection whatever against future Jallianwala massacres, Lahore bombings of families, and assorted law horrors like those in the Punjab last year. Under the new government plan the power of the foreign ruler of the land is to remain just as arbitrary, just as irresponsible to the Indian people as it has ever been. The only protection the people of India can have, the only protection that any people anywhere can have, against the tyranny and injustice of rulers, is power to call the rulers to account. Does the New Government Scheme give the Indian people such power? Not in the slightest degree. They will be just as much at the mercy of General Dyer and Governor Michael O'Dwyer and Viceroy Chelmsford in the future as in the past. Is such a condition of things to be tolerated? England needn't surprise that the Indian people do not hasten to welcome her New Government Scheme. Here is a sufficient reason, even if there were no other: They do not welcome it because it offers them no safety, no protection against outrages in the future as bad as those of the past, that is, as bad as Germany ever perpetrated upon Belgium.

India and the League of Nations

When the League of Nations was formed its cession declared in the most unequivocal terms that one of its first and most important objects was to secure the right of self-determination to

all civilized nations and peoples. This means, if it means anything, that as the earliest possible date the League is to duly bound to take up the case of India, and see to it that a nation of 300,000,000 people, representing one of the oldest civilisations of the world, shall no longer be compelled, against its will, and by the pure might of the sword, to remain a vassal to a foreign power. We are glad to print below a part of a letter which was both clearly and strongly India's claim to this matter. It is addressed to Viscount Grey, President of the League of Nations Union, and is signed by H. M. Jinnah (London representative of the India Home Rule League), Bernard Hodgkin, Mohammed Ali, D. N. Banerjee and other distinguished Indians and Englishmen:

THE LETTER

In full agreement with the sentiment of the League of Nations Union as expressed in its Letter No. 1, we on behalf of the Indian National Congress, respectfully call the governments of the Union to effect the immediate effect of self-Government in India as a first and of the British Commonwealth, and in association with her own efforts to an original member of the League of Nations.

1. It is evident that it is not unreasonable to put to challenge to India the self-determination recognised on Poland and other nations of Europe and the Near East.

2. The expanding sentiment and consciousness of India demand from Great Britain the authoritative order to satisfy the aspirations of the Indian people by the consistent grant of autonomy as to compel them to submission by military power.

3. Great Britain cannot, in honesty, evade the obligation to India, of the various pledges given by British statesmen and the British Cabinet, during the war, that the political and national freedom for which Great Britain was fighting, should be shared by all

peoples in a world 'made safe for Democracy'.

We should be glad if the League of Nations Union will kindly provide facilities for the nominal representatives of India to give a personal statement of the Indian point of view at its Conference, meetings, and particularly at the coming Conference of Milan.

Ireland and India

The New York Nation has just done something which will surely draw attention—the United States, England and Ireland. In its issue of September 25 it prints on its front cover page in very large type the following editorial:

AND WITH ENGLAND

It is because they believe that war between England and the United States would be the greatest calamity which could befall the civilized world, and because they feel that the two countries are equally suffering apart, that the editors of *The Nation* have issued our invitation of their fellow citizens to form a committee to investigate, through a committee, the charges and counter-charges of wrongs in Ireland.

In another and longer editorial the names are given of those who up to the date mentioned had accepted *The Nation's* invitation to become members of such an investigation committee. The number is large—well on toward a hundred—and the men and women making up the list are as eminent as are to be found in the country, and represent all parties and callings—thus lifting the investigation above partisanship and making for it the highest possible degree of efficiency and public confidence.

A committee on common, unselfish, and bold and extraordinary a task, and with the hope of accomplishing an

end of such national and international importance, will be sure to attract the attention of the world. It will be both warmly praised and severely questioned. But will it not be certain to bring to real facts which are now hidden, those needed light upon vital matters which are now in darkness, and thus prepare the way for a powerful settlement of a struggle which has as its possibly very grave national and international danger?

This brave action of *The Nation* suggests the question: Are not other committees needed to make other investigations of quite as great importance as this concerning Ireland? Above all, is not such a committee needed to investigate conditions in India, where there are situations quite as great as any that Ireland has suffered, and affecting a vastly larger number of persons? Such an investigation of Indian conditions would be certain to bring to light facts that would earth and shock the world. But would it not do good? It would let the world know of India's wrongs. It would show to the world the justice of India's struggle for freedom. And might it not be of the highest possible service to England, by moving her from concerning her present kind and narrow policy in India, which is fast turning that formerly peaceful land into a greater and more dangerous India?

When the committee now being formed to investigate Ireland has finished its work, may we not hope that *The Nation* will move to create another to take up the even more important task of investigating India?

Defense of Dyer

Humanitarianism is everywhere, indeed. For example, take the case of General Dyer who, in April, 1919, saved machine guns on thousands of innocent men and women at Amritsar, India. This may not appear to be very per me humanitarian at first glance. But consider the disaster which General Dyer averted—the bloodthirsty rebellion of millions of untutored (eventually trained!) Hindley Indians. Consider the necessity of saving India for the Empire. What would our losses of the British Empire if India, so crown jewel, were suddenly lost? Consider the self-interest of General Dyer himself. Could he let a crowd of ignorant, untrained people laugh at him for not daring to show his might? It becomes all too obvious that General Dyer deserved, not the reward, but the praise of every Empire—English, men and women. And in a prison, too. About 2,000 English women in one province—Bengal—"have appended their signatures to a protest against the treatment accorded to General Dyer" (his dismissal from the army). In England went a fund of fifteen pounds (\$24,000) has been raised to vindicate the honor of the gall general, and to keep him from the penitentiary. Praise be to those noble ladies and gentlemen who have risen to defend a brave soldier and a devoted worker for the welfare of white humanity. The Government in India also announces that General Dyer is to be retired on a pension of 500 pounds a year (\$2,500). A good advertisement for the reputation of the British Government in India for decency and fair play.

The Englishmen Must Shoot

Whatever else happens the Englishman in India must not be deprived of his shooting. The revised Arms Act of India, which has just been published, is the subject of much discussion in the English press of recent date. The former Arms Act, which was enacted in the year 1878, permitted the possession of arms by Europeans (by the "responsible classes in the country"), but made no provision for Indians to hold arms, even for protection from wild animals. The new act has committed this important task of raising the bar to be paid by Europeans for the possession of arms, and of limiting the number of cartridges to be used in a year to 500. The full significance of the hostility which these provisions reflect upon Englishmen may not be readily grasped. Says the *Morning Post*, of London:

One of the great attractions of India for the Englishman has always been the sports facilities for free, unimpeded sport. Now sport is not what it was. The restrictions of cultivation and the extension of railroads have played havoc in a shooting area, with many fine localities, but the simplest are there, and have there men, who there is plenty of game to make sport worth while. But the government mean to snuff the Englishman's sport as difficult as possible.

The use for the hunter alone moves one to tears—it is so painful. Perhaps the worst thing about the new law is the cruel limitation of the number of cartridges to be permitted each hunter. Take the hunter of snipe and duck, for example. "One can imagine the feelings of such a man, if the birds were reported thick and he finds that he had

already expended most of his year's allowance of cartridges."

Our readers will be with us, we hope, in our presentation of sympathy to the European hunters of game in India. Their privilege is holy. The new Arms Act should undoubtedly be repealed. As it stands, the Act prohibits the Englishman from "poor wholesome sport," and without his sport—his sport of killing things—what is he? As for the Indians, of course they do not need arms for protection. Of course wild animals are not dangerous to the case of Indians, and of course burglars are never committed on Indian lands. Therefore, by all means let the new Act be repealed, so that Englishmen may have full liberty to shoot animals of all kinds—even human animals, if they wish, in their Dyce leisure.

Boycotting the Government

From latest Indian papers it appears that the most significant movement that has been known in India since the "Martyr" of 1931—namely, that of boycotting the Government, is in full swing and seems to be increasingly successful. The "non-cooperation-with-the-Government" movement was inaugurated as a protest against the attitude of Great Britain at the treaty of the Turkish Peace Treaty. The Muhammadans of India, numbering 70,000,000, and supported by their Hindu brethren in a fashion never before known, are being led by Mahatma M. K. Gandhi in a movement to cease co-operating with the British rule of the land. As the first step in this program many prominent In-

dians have resigned their posts, have renounced the titles and honors conferred upon them by the British Government, and have withdrawn their children from government schools. On August 1 a complete *dharna* (cessation of business) was observed in all the important cities of the country. Meetings were held, and the people were enjoined to continue to boycott the government, as officials, as clerks, as administrative officers, and in business relations. The *dharna* (boycott) against all home industries (movement in trading in a serious situation in Manchester, where it is reported that several mills have shut down, due to lack of demand in India for British cotton goods. The non-cooperation movement has behind it the widespread support of the Indian people, and therefore it is hoped to create a strong impression in England as well as in India. Many prominent Congress members (leaders of the Indian National Congress) have put their official stamp of approval on the boycott, passing resolutions in support. Reports are coming to England, according to a dispatch in the *Empire News*, at Manchester, that India is "teeming with wrath." Some English members of the Indian Civil Service are contemplating returning to England. In the *Manchester Guardian*, of August 10, is printed a despatch from an Indian gentleman who recently returned from India. He writes:

It will not be very long before we see in India all the bitterness against the English which we see in England. The thousands of Indians are absolutely demoralized. They have now lost, for the old fields of Mohammedan, that most devoted servants have been deliberately snuffed. It is a wonder to me that the thought of the Chinese Empire does not flash upon them. It is a catastrophe

for the whole East. It means a permanent damage of the East by the West. Therefore, both Muslims and Hindus realize that it is time for them to make themselves free before it is too late.

The writer has touched upon an aspect of the problem which really affects America—and that is, a possible conflict between East and West. Racial discrimination, economic pressure, and now, political degradation (the disloyalty of the Turkish Empire is due to the Muslims to name nothing less than that) are combining to convert the people of India into a disaffected, restless mass, ready material for another war. If this condition of things is allowed to go on, the "Peace-that-was-to-be" after the sacrifice of 4,000,000 lives in the World War, will have proved a sad and tragic myth. The rising winds of India are beginning to roar.

In course of a speech delivered in Madras, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, the leader of the non-cooperation movement, said:

I want no revolution. I want ordered progress. I want no chaos. I want real order to be evolved out of the present chaos, which is unorganized anarchy. It will be established by a spirit in order to get rid of the systematic rule of government. I say that it is an order like disorder. I want to realize justice in all the relations. Therefore, I request the British Non-Cooperation (with the existing government). If you will only realize the sense of this powerful demand you will know and you will feel that you do not want to see even an angry word, and that you will not want to let even your finger be alone a wink or a second. I ask my contemporaries to believe no other gospel than the gospel of selflessness which pervades every breath. Whether you belong to the world of violence or of non-violence you will still have to go through the fire of conflict and of discipline.

News in Brief

From Bengal and Orissa come reports of extensive floods which have swept away about 5,000 houses, leaving 35,000 people homeless. What is being done by the government, you ask? Nothing, at least.

* * *

The Indian committee of the Indian National Congress, after heated debates, adopted on Sept. 7 a resolution endorsing M. K. Gandhi's programme of non-cooperation with the British Government.

The programme includes non-payment of taxes, boycott of legislative councils, government educational schools, and government social functions, boycott of foreign goods and gradual non-payment of justice by Indian lawyers. The vote on the Gandhi plan was 148 to 115. The special session of the congress was attended by 30,000 Hindus and Muslims from all parts of India.

* * *

From Calcutta comes the news that at an All-India Conference of Secret Officers, held in August, representatives of the Boy Scout movement, among the students of Southern India, led by Mr. Annie Besant, made a desperate effort to obtain complete freedom from British control, and the abolition of the salute of the King-Emperor from the obligations of loyalty which must be taken by every member of the Scout movement. Standing instead in this crisis. What is wrong with Besant's control that the Scouts should wish to shun freedom? And why should not these boys

wish to pledge loyalty to the King-Emperor? Not in every country are the people given the opportunity of having a King-Emperor. The Indian Scouts must be taught to appreciate their good fortune.

* * *

To leave the disappointment that might be felt in India at the postponement of the visit of the Prince of Wales to India, the British government has announced that the Duke of Connaught will take the Prince's place and, incidentally, "will do much to smooth things down and prepare the way for the Prince's visit the following year." It is a curious way of impressing the people of India with the love and affection of His Majesty, George V, especially at a time, as the world is led to believe, when the Indian people are the most loyal subjects of the British Crown.

* * *

Much has been heard of the migration of Afghans into India. The cause for this movement is the general dissatisfaction that has arisen in India as a result of the attitude of the Government of India on the Turkish Peace settlement, which so seriously affects the Mohammedans in India. News comes now from Afghanistan of a counter migration of Afghans into India. Most of the migrants are merchants and traders who anticipate a Balkanized postwar world, anticipate a Balkanized postwar world, and civil strife accompanying it. The merchants are therefore leaving the country while it is still possible for them to leave unhindered.

The Meaning of India's Demand

For Self-Determination

By J. T. SALVENDY

What do the people of India mean when they agree, as for many years they have been doing, for Home Rule—for Home Rule like that at Canada and Australia? Do they mean continued slavery to the British Empire, or slavery of any kind? No, they mean freedom. Canada is free, Australia is free. Both made and maintain their own laws. Their connection with the Empire is voluntary: they could break it if they chose, but they prefer not to break it; they are advantage in preserving it. Thus they hold in their own hands the power of self-determination. Essentially this is what India means and wants.

The Editor of the London weekly, India, which is the British organ of the Indian National Congress, discusses this question well in a recent issue. Says that able English interpreter of India:

As to the question of India's remaining or not remaining in the British Empire, the problem may be clearly stated thus: The policy of the Indian National Congress (which can be said without question to represent the people of India), is and has always been, self-government within the Empire. But it is not always clear to a number of their own chiefs. There must be the final decision. The Congress has asked for self-government within the Empire, and so must mean to suppose, because loyalty to the British Empire, in any and all circumstances, is a sort of divine imperative imposed upon all peoples who have come either upon or without that continent, within an indefinite field, but because the British Empire stands for certain ideals, and because Indian interests have become through political and economic connections inextricably bound up with the British Empire. For that reason there is ground for hope that the people of India will prefer

to remain as part of the Empire (as Canada and Australia are thought to wish) on their own terms, than to break away by the granting of adequate measures of autonomy.

The essential thing is, India must have freedom, must have self-determination. If and when that can be secured to her, then the closer her association and co-operation with England the better.

To be sure, England is not India's mother-country, as she is the mother-country of Canada and Australia, therefore, India cannot have just the same reasons for desiring to maintain permanent connection with England that Canada and Australia have. But there may be other reasons hardly less weighty, if the connection can be made one of equality, of co-operation and division of mutual advantage. Some have thought the distance of England from India an obstacle to their union. But why? That Canada and Australia are so distant from the globe from England makes their union with her in some respect more desirable and more useful to both parties than if they were near one another, just as the alliance between Japan and England gains certain advantages from the fact that one of the nations is in Europe and the other in Asia. There are thinking minds both in Great Britain and in India who believe that nothing else could be so great an advantage as all concerned, and that nothing else could do so much to preserve the peace of the world, as a great world-spanning

international and interracial Empire, or another Confederation, of free Asiatic and European peoples, and especially of free Indian and Anglo-Indian peoples. India has had a long association with Great Britain as her subject and slave. May not a happier future have to await her both nations a better relation—a partnership in freedom, and thus a joint mission as leaders of the world to a higher and better civilization? But if they cannot be associated as real partners, each respecting and treating the other as an equal, and co-operating in ways to be mutually advantageous, then they should part as two separate and friendly nations, each to pursue her own

path and to build her own distinctive mission in the world.

The question of vital importance to both nations, and of tremendous consequences to the world, is, will Great Britain be wise enough and noble enough to choose either of these courses of action? Or will she persist in attempting to hold on to subjugate a nation of 300,000,000 civilized people—masters of all the other human race—against their natural wish and will? If she does the latter, the only possible result will be a war, a revolution, or the most bloody and terrible nature, by which she will be driven out of India, if not out of all Asia.

The Co-operative Movement

One of the most encouraging movements in the economic progress of India is the growth of the co-operative idea among the agricultural and urban workers of the country. Although the movement is at present in its initial stage, rapid development may be expected, for India with her heritage of the communal spirit (the village *panchayat* system of communal government was prevalent up to the time of the British conquest of India) is peculiarly fitted to develop a system such as the co-operative movement.

Co-operative activities in India widen every time as the mode of government operation. This is not surprising if one remembers that for any progressive enterprise a small amount of capital is essential, and that in India at least 70 per cent of the people are hopelessly in debt, and never possess the faint surplus of their earnings, above the govern-

ment taxes, the money lenders, and other creditors are paid. Interest rates on borrowed money range from 5 to 50 per cent. And the debts are rarely redeemed.

It was to remedy this situation that the government in 1910 passed the Land Improvement Loans Act and endeavored to lend money to cultivators for the improvement and eventual ownership of the plots of land which they worked. The necessity of this task began by the government—supplying the credit of about 70 per cent of the people of a country like India, who are engaged in agriculture—demanded the act to follow. The following year (1911) an *Agriculturists' Loans Act* was passed, which provided for the lending of money to cultivators for the purchase of seed, cattle, and miscellaneous agricultural purposes. Like its predecessor, this act also proved disappointing in its application. Somewhat

discouraged, the government made no further attempt for a few years to aid the poverty-stricken peasantry. In the early thirties Sir William Wedderburn, a prominent leader of India, had presented a scheme for the establishment of agricultural banks to Lord Ripon's government. The plan received the approval of the officials, but nothing was done about it. Some years later Sir Dames, as Lord Canservat, decided to establish some private "people's banks," and succeeded in opening several in different parts of the country. But the movement was not sufficiently significant to take root.

It was not until after the terrible famine of 1899-1900 that serious consideration was given to the relief of the income-stricken peasants. In 1901 an investigation was begun into the economic conditions of the ryots (farmers) and other workers. In 1904, under the vicereignty of Lord Curzon, the Co-operative Credit Societies Act was passed, providing for the organization of societies in every Province. The function of these organizations was to "raise funds by deposits from members and loans from non-members (government and private agencies) and the distribution of this money by way of loans to members." For a time the act seemed to function properly and usefully. But as the movement took root more widely, the provisions of 1904 proved too limited. Accordingly, in 1920, by the passage of a further measure, known as the Co-operative Societies' Act, provision was made for the formation of societies other than credit organizations. This extension of the co-operative movement to embrace all forms of activities, marked a new stage in its development in India.

Co-operative activities in India at the present time are divided into three distinct classes—the credit society for the agriculturists, the non-agriculturalist society for trades people, and the buying and selling society for the urban workers.

The agricultural societies exist for the purpose of lending money to poor agriculturists—and who is not poor in India!—especially at sowing time. Loans are advanced in the cultivation for the purchase of live stock, fiddles, seed, implements, and even for the irrigation of the land, and the digging of wells. Up to 1913-1908 there were in India a total of 20,325 agricultural credit societies, with a membership of 18,121, and with a working capital of about \$12,811,250.

The agricultural societies are managed gradually; accounts are audited annually by a government official. Loans are made on property but this insurance is of secondary importance, the foremost stipulation being the personal honesty and integrity of the borrower. The greatest problem which the agricultural societies face is that of financing their enterprises. Central Banks, owned by the government and, loyal to the officials; joint stock banks are sometimes persuaded to make advances, non-agricultural societies are often ready to extend their help, in some instances the government pays funds at the disposal of the co-operatives. All of these loans are met by the co-operative societies when the harvest is raised and when money is realized by the ryots from the sale of their crops. To facilitate the work of the co-operative societies in the Bombay Presidency there was started in 1911 a Bombay Central Co-operative Bank, which lends to all registered co-operative societies in the presidency. In other

parts of the country similar institutions have been established.

Next in importance to the agricultural societies are what is known as co-operative organisations. These have been established to meet the wants of townspeople engaged in handicrafts or in trade, or employed in government departments. In these societies there is a share-capital; working capital is secured from local deposits. The functions of these co-operative societies is, generally, to furnish loans to their own members for the pursuit of their trades, for house-building projects, for the purchase of new materials for small industries, and for food and other necessities of life. In 1926-27 there were about 1,200 such agricultural societies, with a membership of 176,708. These bodies, comprised, as they are, of tradesmen and craftsmen, have not experienced so much difficulty in securing capital. The demands of these groups are not unusual. Therefore, the membership is a rung higher on the ladder of prosperity, and success does not mean a constant struggle between starvation and the masses. In some of the co-operative societies there are considerable money balances on hand after the needs of their members have been met. These surplus sums are sometimes loaned to the agricultural sections.

Least developed of all is the co-operative movement among the factory workers. In the case of agricultural workers and of small tradesmen there is a certain amount of private ownership—small as it may be. Factory workers, however, can have, not at all, but of overwhelming facilities. The major portion

of the factory workers are employed in the textile mills, where hours are more likely long and wages notoriously low. It is in the urban community, where the worker is a victim of landlord, money-lender, and shopkeeper, that the co-operative credit society and the co-operative store for retail selling is most needed. To a very small extent, such stores and societies have been established. In 1926-27 there were fifteen co-operative stores in Madras, eighteen in Bombay, eight in the United Provinces, and several in other parts, supplying the needs of the people for food and clothes. The co-operative societies which are now maintaining stores also lend money to their members. Much effort has been made to promote this service by the Royal Service League of Bombay, which has succeeded in establishing a number of Credit Societies. In Bombay City alone have also been started three Housing Societies, to relieve the distress of the factory workers in their housing problem. In Madras town Building Associations have been started.

Among the several miscellaneous efforts made in the direction of co-operation may be mentioned the establishment of a Co-operative Printing Press in Kanara (Madras). Several co-operative societies have been created by weavers, carpenters, millmen, and others, to meet their special needs.

From the above it will be seen that although the Co-operative Movement in India is by no means extensive, her beginnings have been made, and there is much hope for a more vigorous development. What this movement signifies may easily be imagined. It means, first, a growing spirit of economic independ-

ence, based on united effort and individual efforts. Even more significantly, it means a reduction of the all-powerful

idea of unity—of co-operation, through which can eventually be achieved in India free development of the people.

Indian Soldiers in Mesopotamia

Recent despatches from India (the summer capital of India) and from London, indicate that the Government of India is doing all it can to add fuel to the fire of the growing discontent of the Indian people, by despatching experienced able-bodied men from the Indian army to Mesopotamia. Mesopotamia furnished oil to the British Empire. Mr. Tardieu declared recently in a public statement that in March, 1924, the whole of the oil deposits in Mesopotamia were granted to a British oil company by the Sultan, 35 per cent of the capital invested being British and 65 per cent German. After the war, the British company turned over to France the German share in the company, thereby securing a necessary ally in its march to Mesopotamia. To protect the interests of the oil company British engineers must needs be ordered to the sacred field. Lately these English and some Indian engineers have been sent from India to Mesopotamia to put down revolts in the region, and this at a time when public feeling in India is more intense than ever against the use of Indian troops for the benefit of British oil companies. The India Office in London, cognisant of the situation, has announced that to those who join in the campaign will be given a gratuity of a month's pay, after satisfactory service.

Great Britain has secured a mandate

over Mesopotamia. In translating this policy into action, she has shown that India is the major source of her strength, whereas it is India her weakness occurs. Before the recent trouble in Mesopotamia began there were stationed 25,000 British and 95,000 Indian soldiers in the country. Now the proportion of Indian soldiers to English is larger still. These figures were given by Major General Sir Frederick Maunsell in an interview in the London Daily News of September 3.

Even within British ranks there is growing and disquieting with the increasing understandings of the Empire. An ex-officer in the Mesopotamia campaign has written to the London Times recently condemning British policy. He says, in part:

"Our government is weaker than the old Turkish empire. They kept thousands of men and found resources, and killed a fairly average of two hundred Arabs in maintaining peace. We keep twenty thousand men who, equipped, equipped men, gun-borne, and equipped men. We have heard about an thousand Arabs during the past summer. We say we are in Mesopotamia in order to see the hands of the world. All events say that the later supply in the rising factor in development. Now the will the killing of two thousand villages and co-operation under the protection of whom, control and all? How long will we permit millions of people, thousands of imperial troops and men of thousands of Arabs to be sacrificed or killed of a few of oilmen

administration which can hardly satisfy the circumstances.

The feeling in India regarding the matter of employing Indian soldiers to conquer and hold in subjection peoples who have a right to be free, is well expressed by the editor of *The Mahatma* (Poona) in his issue of August 15. His words are:

Among the many important matters that will come up for discussion before the special session of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League will be the least important will be the question of demanding the withdrawal of Indian soldiers from Turkey, Mesopotamia, Berlin, Austria and Peking. There scarcely appears any chance to think that the politicians demanding the draft of our soldiers from these countries will be consciously stopped. It is notorious that the most genuine of Indian soldiers who are being made use of in the different theatres of war in the West and Middle East are roughly drawn the likeness of freedom loving people anxious to do something of good in some far corner. They feel, the use of soldiers to such large numbers for purposes alien to our race, our principles and our civilisation constitutes an ugly shadowing blot on the national self-respect, but counts us as a nation of hypocrites in the eyes of our Asiatic fellow-citizens, as

we have already been branded as a nation of cowards by the British colonies.

The reasons demanding the recall of our soldiers are as numerous as they are true. For only those are likely to be able to gain any moral material or economic advantages from the possession of distant places in Egypt and Asia Minor, but the very occupation of these places is a source of injury to various work, and in domestic industries, are consequently lowered and deflected industries. This expenditure on our forces not only reduces the adopted commerce of India but constitutes the government a source of one of our national calamities. Will any the contrary think in the deliberate stamping down of his people will? Will any the Council of the All-India Muslim League and the Congress party agree on the use of Muslim and Indian soldiers in the Middle East for the purpose of suppressing the religious and patriotic movements of Indians and will that the poor, Mohammedan Tajiks, who have been deprived of the right to carry arms in the name of self-protection, are being turned into fighting automata for the conventional aggressiveness of a nation whose politicians are already no leaders, even for the moral category or physical strength.

In fact all these warnings seem to have been lost upon the British statement. Will they continue to be voluntary?

labor situation in this city, as well as in other centers, because we think that at least a British commission was appointed (in 1928) to investigate and report on the general conditions in industry. A survey was made of the textile industry, but many of the findings were never revealed and are recently.

From a reading of the report on the Bombay textile industry—and it may be taken as fairly typical of conditions in other industrial centers—it becomes apparent why the facts concerning the terrible branch of the country's industries never saw the light of day until now. The report is a ghastly revelation of the misery and suffering, of the extreme injustice and exploitation, prevalent in the textile industry. Says the report: "The number of looms-down, unattended looms is not inconsiderable here (in Bombay) and may be said to be rapidly increasing so long as present conditions continue."

The reasons for this are evident from an examination of the housing situation which is presented in all its gruesome details. The misery of laborers here is shown which are described as follows:

The shanty is a miserable structure usually designed for the poorer classes. It is from 10 to 15 feet, with from 10 to 20 rooms, or even more.

In such rooms, which, quote Bombay by-laws, must be 100 square feet (30 feet square), where there is hardly any room to move while families sleep, dress, eat their food, and perform all the functions of family life. Some of the rooms are nothing more than holes beneath sloping roofs, in which a mere canvas mat is spread. The poor rooms are usually dark and gloomy in the extreme and it is only on a clear afternoon, when one's eyes have become accustomed to the gloom, that the occupants who share families live in such poor conditions. The average number of

inhabitants in such a room is 15.

The effect of the system of living under such conditions is appalling. The average life of an employee is about 35 years. Almost 50 per cent of the workers are married (in the city of Bombay). Of these, 37 per cent have had by birth 10 or more children. Sometimes per cent have just three or more children; the remaining 16 per cent have their children living. The infantile death rate in Bombay city has gone as high as 600 per thousand. Some of the workers' children suffer the same psychic and mental consequences of the deplorable conditions of their earlier years, but very few attain a value attached to womanhood.

To be sure, attempts have been made by some philanthropically inclined mill owners to ameliorate conditions. But these are but a mere drop in the bucket. Little can be done so long as wages, for one thing, are so low. Wages are paid every month. The average monthly earnings of a family are \$100. The cost of food and rent alone exceeds the income. This leaves nothing for clothing, doctor bills or education. About 10 per cent of the population is constantly in debt. To meet this monthly deficit, the laborer must be incessantly borrowing, and incessantly paying interest on his debts. The monthly interest alone amounts to \$150. And added to this indebtedness, comes a rise in food prices. Since 1914 food prices have advanced 200 per cent, while wages have gone up only 25 per cent. Aside from the severe starvation, which drives the laborer to the money lender, are such as theft; marriages, funerals, burial expenditures for engagement of brides (of only married people), funerals, etc. The burden of indebtedness the laborer struggles all

How Bombay Treats Textile Labor

It is a commonly accepted truth that in the wake of the industrial revolution in all countries have come multifarious suffering and misery. Whether machinery and the wage system have been introduced, disease, poverty, and all the concomitant evils of death-life have also appeared. Of this fact, India furnishes a most excellent example.

Nothing reveals more vividly the status of the Indian factory worker and

his inhuman discrimination with the conditions under which he is forced to work, than the report of strikes, which have taken place since the beginning of this year. Within a period of one-two days it has been estimated that 125 strikes took place—83 of them in Bombay city alone.

Bombay is a great center of the textile industry, and it is a typically industrial city of India. Several years ago the

through his life to chain all, but rarely succeeds.

To the list of grievances outlined above may be added that of hours of labor. The working day for laborers in Bombay begins at sunrise and ends at sundown. At least twelve hours, with a 30 minute intermission for lunch, are spent at work. Millowners justify this exploitation of labor by the contention that a shorter work day would not result in greater efficiency. With such an overabundance of men, and such magnificent wages, the laborers are expected to educate themselves! The Merchant's Bureau, in its evidence before the Commission, states:

Mill hands, it appears, do not take adequate advantage of the night schools, in which 12 hours of physical training they are no doubt subjected to in addition to night schools.

How then, is the laborer to be educated to a higher standard of living? With the triple affliction of Heat—bad housing, long hours, and low wages—there is but one remedy—the constant weakening of the nation's industrial man-power. From the mass of misery which the labor situation presents comes

one gleam of hope—the growing momentum for the organization of the workers into labor unions. In Bombay a trade union, embracing about 100,000 workmen, has been formed. Through such bodies do the laborers endeavor to secure a modicum of justice in the trade trade.

Then, there, are the conditions of workableness in one of the most prosperous Indian industrial centers.

There is little doubt that the progress of industrialism in India depends upon the use of more than one weapon. Efforts India's cause has been one of liberation from a foreign yoke through political reforms. The international relations of the present day, however, have forced this battle for Indian freedom to be fought to an increasing degree on the basis of cooperation with the workers in other countries, because it is the workers of England, France and industrially of America that help perpetuate all around us a stronghold in India. Scarcely that is asked the workers of the country need to perform a duty—a duty however remote is as significant as the present moment—and that is the unleashing of every opportunity possible to expose imperialism and exploitation in India.

Blacker than the "Black Hole"

Perhaps nothing in the entire modern history of India is cited so often as an evidence of the barbarity of the Indian people, of the inferiority of their civilization to that of the British, of their inability to govern themselves, and of the great losses that British Rule is to them, as the story of the "Black Hole" of Calcutta.

What is the story? In brief it is,

that in the year 1756, during a time of war between the British and the Indians of Calcutta and vicinity (while the British concept of India was in progress), an Indian officer confined a party of 145 captured Europeans for a night, during the hot weather of June, without water, in a small room all dark by 12 feet and 20 inches, ventilated by only two small windows; and that on

the morning 123 of the number (all but 22) were found to have died for want of water and air.

Several historical investigations who have looked carefully into the incident declare that the story is pure fiction—the invention of the man who wrote it, who pretended that such a tragic event happened and that he was one of the survivors. In our last issue, on page 335, we have referred to one such investigation. However for our present purpose let us suppose the story to be true, true in every particular. This being granted, what does it show regarding the Indian people? That they are today barbarians? That they are more cruel or lower in civilization than the British, and that they ought to be ruled by British? Let us see.

Beyond dispute, the story is a very shocking one. Whoever in any land or age is guilty of perpetrating such an atrocity is worthy of the very strongest condemnation. But let us be fair and just. Does this story of the Black Hole stand alone? Is it a story of today, or of the distant past? Are there not other stories as shocking as this, and even more shocking, connected with British history in India? Let us compare this for every supposed Black Hole event (the story is true), with an event near at hand, of our own day, and about the truth of which there can be no possible doubt: we mean the Amritsar massacre, which took place in India only last year.

Let us compare it with the Black Hole case, in two which is the darker.

1. As we have already seen, the number suffered in the Black Hole was

123, while the number slaughtered in Amritsar was from 700 to 1,000, or from 4 to 8 times as many; while from 15 to 20 times as many others (between 2,000 and 3,000) were wounded, many of them crippled for life.

2. The Black Hole destruction of life occurred in a time of war, and the lives sacrificed were those of persons who according to the laws of war were enemies. The Amritsar murders were perpetrated in a time of peace, and the lives destroyed were those of peaceful subjects of the very government that destroyed them.

3. The Black Hole atrocity took place near the middle of the Eighteenth century, 154 years ago, in an age much less enlightened than our own. The society at Amritsar was committed last year, in the full light of the Twentieth century.

These comparisons may well suggest at least two very practical questions:

1. If that long-ago horror of 1756 governs the barbarity of the "native" government in a small section of India a century and a half ago (as it unquestionably does), does it does not the vastly worse horror of 1919 prove the barbarity of the British Government to-day?

2. If England has a right to use the crime of the Black Hole; as she has been doing for a century and a half, and is doing still) as an evidence that the Indian people are unable to rule themselves, has not the world a right to use the far greater and blacker crime of Amritsar as an evidence that England is unfit to rule the Indian people?

O'Flaherty on Indian Self-Government

(With Apologies to Mr. Dooley)

"We don't understand the question, Dooley. That goes without a say-ry thinkin'."

"Ye see, 'bout was hundred an' fifty years ago, we goes over to Japan ('er'us) 'cause they was Makin' war on poor, an' 'boutless in want as ourselves (an'), an' we see, 'Look 'er'us, we see; 'we can plenty see an' 'we p'fer see as those countries and gold-mines an' so proper natural riches."

"Oh? they see."

"'We, we see, 'we will teach ye 'we to dig up poor country, an' teach ye as will see's best to dig the poor natural riches. We've got a lot, we see, 'twenty-five a piece, an' all different; as there ye are."

"'No, thanks, they see. 'Ye see, they see, 'we don't dig at all but here we learn. An' we'll like to show ye a shop or two, if ye'd only go back to yer home."

"So the Field-Marshal in charge as th' Navy that we've got out see. 'Well, 'e see, 'e's plenty a man as a White Man's Blue-eyes."

"So, then a lot us fight an' take away their things (as they see used to gain) in th' present, we carry 'em. An' later on we parties 'em all sorts o' things, an' we made Viceroy out to 'em (as as they can spend their pocket-money in paper) then and give still more wages than they used get anywhere else if they was to work for it), an' Civil Service an' Lieutenant-

Governors (we couldn't get a word in Parliament), an' all th' people we's got now what's too was to let us th' 'Queer as Law-did us' too busy to go in th' Army, an' Government, an' irrigation, speeches, an' dinner-tables, an' schoolmasters (which lost their appointments as correspondence with) to there 'bout as was on for a month or two); an' we more Proclamations printed 'em all they want; an' we print th' Proclamations with ever-changing ink, an' when they look at th' date they find it two years after what they thought we'd told 'em. An' all that was in thing."

"Ye see, Dooley, that's what ye call Diplomacy, commonly known as th' Double an' Rule or Three Hundred Millions."

"But they ain't satisfied."

"'Look you,' they see. 'We want self-govern'ment."

"'What's what?' an' th' Viceroy. 'Who thought ye that big word-did?'"

"'Oh,' they see. 'We know it all as was a th' Parliament when ye give us about fifty or sixty years ago. We've been waiting on,' they see, 'an' we've just ain't understood it!'"

"'What's his talkin' ye this?' an' th' Viceroy. 'I know what it is; ye've been listenin' to some an' them Russian agents!'"

"'No, we ain't,' they see. 'We only want to be able to govern ourselves!'"

"'What?' an' th' Viceroy. 'What to do what?'"

"'We want to govern ourselves in a small way,' they see. 'We've had a Congress, an' we've come to th' conclusion that we can apply our own judge at our own expense, an' be kind as Russia at our own expense, as do with th' country at our own expense (as' satisfaction, maybe); an' take th' rule up an' have 'em up almost as well as you do—made a little practice. An' we reckon we can do away with a thousand or two a year, maybe. An', after all, if it only means givin' ye a cut from th' hundred what we carry for ye, an' a lot more satisfaction an' less expense for us!'"

"'Good! Good!' an' th' Viceroy. 'It's treason what ye're sayin'. We know ye've got a conspiracy on to do away as was th' see. This is all th' thanks we get for our kindness! What was ye when we first came across ye? Nuthin' but a crowd as uneducated heathens, with no game but cattle!—only rice and other things to eat. An' look at present now. Look what we've done for ye! Thirt' times (which we don't let ye ride in as we wants to keep 'em a bit cheap), an' ye follow us (as we let's ye present ride in th' third class what there's any room), an' the satisfaction, what we hang over here for ye to have a look at an' run behind. Where would ye be without us?'"

"'An' then ye talk as ye farmers. What about 'em? Don't they just come as ye was workin'! Youe there's half a million dyin' a week, don't it put more as ye in work as busy 'em? An' while ye're dyin' an' famin' ye're not

thinkin' of what else there's what ye've got to think at! But it's no good an' talkin' to ye. I can see ye're absolutely unreasonable. Ye want to kill th' King an' see, an' th' Commander-in-Chief (just that I think that much), an' every-body!'"

"'No, we don't,' an' th' Indians. 'We're loyal enough, an' we'll show ye in a bit, if ye don't mind treatin' us!'"

"'What?' an' th' Viceroy. 'Why, we couldn't hear as it. What are I going to do, an' all my relations who's here on your reference? An' what's th' Commander-in-Chief goin' to do, an' who's he goin' to spend with when I'm gone?'"

"'Well,' they see, 'we don't mind 'avin' a row with 'em, but 'e won't speak to us!'"

"'Look here,' an' th' Viceroy. 'We wouldn't what ye're talkin'—talkin' more as here. An' ye'll go to prison for ten years, that for ye!'"

"'So they all goes to prison. An' then what ain't accidentally hang with a petition to Parliament when they comes out, said for a trial."

"'An' when a new Governor comes into power they get as, an' the Judges what goes 'em as that they ain't guilty as th' crime for which they're there ten years, an' he discharge 'em without a spot on their character."

"'An' it's all through them ye Indians here! Justified!'"

"'No,' said Mr. Dooley

"'Ye, it's a terrible thing, this White Man's Blue-eyes. That's no thanks!'"

J. H. M. J.

England and the Mohammedans

The world little realises how large an amount of Mohammedan territory has been seized by Great Britain and is now under British rule. For more than two years Great Britain (as also other Christian powers) has been extending her dominion by force of arms over Mohammedan peoples in Asia and Africa, wherever she could find a pretext. This had gone on to such an extent that when the great war in Europe began, in 1914, King George V held three or four times as many Mohammedan subjects under his sway as any Mohammedan ruler in the world. Great Britain proclaimed that the war was fought, on the part of the allies, in the interests of freedom, and to prevent weaker peoples from being conquered and ruled against their will, in the future, by stronger nations. Therefore it was taken for granted by Mohammedan peoples that further aggressions on them would not be allowed—that no more of them would be reduced to subjugation by England, or by any other of the allies.

But didn't how they have been dishonoured! No more was the war over than the grabbing of territory, mostly Mohammedan territory, began. In addition to the vast areas which Great Britain claimed in eastern, western, central and southern Africa (great empires in prospect), and mostly Mohammedan in India, she proceeded at once also to make use of her supremacy over Mohammedan Arabia, to hasten her grip prominently on Mohammedan Egypt, to seize great Mohammedan Persia, and

to enter on such a break-up of Mohammedan Turkey as would leave the largest part of it (including Mesopotamia and Palestine) under British sway.

This great, this injustice, this vast breaking of faith (for many Mohammedans had supported the Allies in the war, with the promise that they and their religions should be protected) was too much for the Mohammedan world. The last straw was Turkey. Nay that the Turks are specially beloved by other Mohammedans; they are not. But it is as happened that Turkey was the last Mohammedan empire or independent nation of any considerable strength left in the world; and, moreover, it was the seat of the Khalifah,—that is to say, the Sultan of Turkey claimed to be the "Khalifah" or religious "successor of Mohammed," and hence the highest ecclesiastical official (in a sense the Pope) of the Muslim peoples. These facts alarmed and aroused the whole Muslim world.

Especially was the indignation great in India, where more than 70,000,000 Muslims had been loyal in England during the war, and had sent great numbers of their sons to fight for her in Mesopotamia and Palestine. Now they felt that they were betrayed. The mistake by Great Britain of so many Mohammedan lands to which it was believed that the Allies were under obligation to give freedom, and especially the destruction of Turkey, the last important Mohammedan nation in the world and with it the virtual centre of their

world Khalifah,—this was more than they could stand.

Here we have an explanation, in part, of the serious trouble which Great Britain is having at the present time in India. Of course the earlier and the deeper cause of India's unrest is her subject condition,—her people's indignation and sense of wrong that they, a great civilised nation with a great past, should be held in subjugation by force of arms to a foreign power. But now that pit many years of wrong is compounded by this new injustice, the new humiliations and made to the whole Mohammedan world, which they consider Great Britain's present treatment of Turkey and the Khalifah to be. The matter is made more serious, too, by the fact that the feeling of injustice on the part of the 70,000,000 Muslims of India has communicated itself to the 400,000,000 Muslims, so that virtually the whole population of India, Mohammedan and

Hindu alike, is seething with such unrest and such distrust of England as it has never known before.

For a long time past Great Britain has claimed to be the friend and protector of Mohammedan peoples. During many decades she sided with Turkey against Russia and fought the Crimean War on Turkey's side. It was because of her support that the "luckiest man" so long retained his place in Europe. This friendly attitude toward Mohammedans, and especially toward Turkey, has had a great influence in keeping the large Muslim population of India loyal to the British power. But now, that Great Britain has lost the confidence of Mohammedans everywhere, including India, her greatest and most important dependency, what will happen in India? What will happen in other parts of the Mohammedan world? These are serious questions.

The Doctrine of the Sword

The following article on the past and cause of wronging as it relates to the *Non-Resistance Movement* in India today, appeared in a recent number of "Young India," the English weekly newspaper. It is of the nature also endeavored to point out the foundation of the largest movement which is in progress in India now.

I am not pleading for India to practice non-resistance because it is right. I want her to practice non-resistance being convinced of her strength and power. Her refusal to resist is against the confidence of her strength. We can no more in her case use a trick that we are but a lump of flesh. I want India to recognise that she has a soul that cannot perish and that her non-resistance means many physical weakness and help for

physical condition of a whole world. I do not want all India to regard the great traditions of the spiritual life in the political world. India considers herself to be pure and purified before the world, and she will not let the weakness of the English. And she takes up non-resistance as of her weakness. It must not move the non-resistance, simply, being her delivery from the crushing weight of British empire of a millions number of people prison it. It will not fall through the history of religion. It may fall because of poverty of religion. There will be the new but not change. The high moral men, who are unable to suffer physical condition any longer, will want to see their world. They will take to violence. In the past I know, they must perish without following themselves in their own

my from the wrong. If India takes up the doctrine of the sword, she may gain momentary victory. Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart. I am wedded to India because I owe my all to her. I believe absolutely that she has a mission for the world. She is not to copy Europe blindly. India's acceptance of the doctrine of the sword will be the hour of my trial. I hope I shall not be found wanting. My religion has no geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself. My life is dedicated to service of India through the religion of non-violence which I believe to be the root of Buddhism.

Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean weak submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means the putting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Working under this law of our being, it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honour, his religion, his soul and lay the foundation for that empire's fall or its regeneration.

I appreciate the sentiment of those who cry out for the punishment of General Dyer and his ilk. They would tear him to pieces if they could. But I do not believe India to

be helpless. I do not believe myself to be a helpless creature. Only I want to use India's and my strength for a better purpose.

We in India may in a moment realize that one hundred thousand Englishmen need not frighten three hundred million human beings. A definite forgiveness would therefore mean a definite recognition of our strength. With enlightened forgiveness must come a mighty wave of strength in us, which would make it impossible for a Dyer to keep affront upon India's divided head. India can gain more by waiving the right of punishment. We have better work to do, a better mission to deliver to the world.

The religion of non-violence is not meant merely for the Selves. It is meant for the common people as well. Non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit has dominion in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law—to the strength of the spirit.

I have therefore ventured to place before India the ancient law of self-sacrifice. For Satyagrah and its offshoots, non-cooperation and civil resistance are nothing but means for the law of suffering.

"There is no trace in this book of anything except disinterested idealism and a horror of the evil portrayed."—
Francis Hackitt.

THE OPIUM MONOPOLY

By ELLEN N. LA MOTTE

Regular price, \$1.00

Special Offer

One Year's subscription to YOUNG INDIA (regular price, \$1.50) and a copy of La Motte's OPIUM MONOPOLY (regular price, \$1.00)

for \$2.00

"YOUNG INDIA", 1400 Broadway, New York City.

LANTERN SLIDES

1. View of the Jallianwala Park.
- 2 and 3. Views of the heavily-shelled walls of the Park.
4. View of the "Crawling Order" being ordered.
5. "Who would be free?"—cartoon.
6. "Help India Free Herself!"—cartoon.
7. Photograph of General Dyer.

Organizers, students, lecture bureaus, speakers, etc., will find this set most useful in their work.

Price per set.....\$6.00